

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-18 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 3-6, 9 and 13 are amended; and Claims 14-18 are added by the present amendment. Support for the new and amended claims can be found in the original specification, claims and drawings. Thus, no new matter is presented.

In the Final Office Action of February 8, 2008 (herein, the Final Office Action), Claims 1 and 3-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. 6,248,946 to Dwek in view of U.S. Pub. 2002/0032027 to Kirani. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as independent Claims 1, 9 and 13 recite novel features clearly not taught or rendered obvious by the applied references.

As described in an exemplary embodiment at Figs. 8 and 16 of the specification, independent Claims 1, 9 and 13 are directed to an authentication server (e.g., server 413) at a client service provider 18 that executes authentication between a mobile information terminal 10 and a content providing server 403. The mobile station registers unique identification information with a customer database 414 of the authentication server, and the authentication server presents, to the mobile information terminal, a recommended menu including site access information for accessing predetermined ***content providing servers*** 403. The ***authentication server*** is also configured to receive the unique identification information and a request for registering one of said official site access information for accessing the ***content providing server*** with a personal menu via the open network. A determination module in the authentication server determines whether the unique identification information received from said mobile information terminal is registered with said customer database, and an interface of the authentication server transmits ***a notification to said content providing server, by***

which said requested site is produced, that starting of service provision for said mobile information terminal be permitted, if the unique identification information is found registered with said customer database by the determination module. A registering module at the authentication server then registers the requested official site access information with said personal menu after receiving an acknowledgement response of said notification from said content providing server, and the authentication server presents, to said mobile information terminal, a completion of said registration.

Thus, Claims 1, 9 and 13 are directed to an authentication server n a system, such as that depicted in Fig. 8, which includes the authentication server 413, a mobile terminal 10 and a content providing server 403. Further, the authentication server 413 transmits a notification to the content providing server 403, by which a requested site is produced, that starting of service provision for the mobile information terminal be permitted, if the unique identification information is found registered with the customer database by the determination module.

In contrast, Dwek, the applied primary reference, fails to teach or suggest the interaction between an authentication server and a content providing server, as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 13.

Dwek describes a system for delivering multimedia content to computers 130 over a network. A media player 120 at each computer includes a user interface allowing a listener to search an online database of media selections and build a custom playlist of the music selections desired by the listener.¹

More particularly, the Advisory Action of June 10, 2008 cites various portions of Dwek in maintaining the rejection of Claims 1, 9 and 13. Col. 4, ll. 46-52 and 61-64 of Dwek describes that a user may select songs from an on-line music database 114, which are indexed

¹ Dwek, Abstract and Fig. 1.

by song title, artist, etc., and that translation/streaming servers 118 provide the interface points for one or more users to access the music from the song file servers 116. Col. 10, ll. 4-20 of Dwek describes that the online music system 100 may include three different types of channels, namely, preprogrammed channels, user-defined channels, and shared channels, which may be broadcast to a user. Dwek at col. 9, ll. 19-45 further describes that a user may create a playlist of songs, which is stored at the online music library 110 and is accessible to all registered users of the online music system 100. This shared playlist may be broadcast as one of the user defined channels noted above and can be listened to by other client computers accessing the online music library 110. Col. 10, ll. 13-67 of Dwek describes further details regarding how user defined channels can be created by a user.

As noted above, however, Dwek fails to teach or suggest the interaction between an authentication server and a content providing server, as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 13. More particularly, Dwek's system includes only an online music library 110 and a personal computer 130, which interact to provide the above noted music content to a user, and does not include three separate components as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 13.

Claims 1, 9 and 13, in contrast, are directed to an authentication server that interacts with both a content providing server and a mobile terminal. More specifically, Claim 1 recites, in part, “*a sending a notification from the authentication server to said content providing server by which said requested site is produced*, that starting of service provision for said mobile information terminal be permitted, *if the unique identification information is found registered with said customer database* [of the authentication server].” Such a configuration allows a user a of a mobile terminal to directly access a content provider, which is then left with the task of performing user authentication with the authentication server.

Dwek, on the other hand, merely describes a process of directly accessing an online music library 110 from a personal computer 130. More particularly, in rejecting the claimed

features directed to the “sending step,” the Final Office Action cites col. 12, ll. 15-21 and col. 15, ll. 34-40 of Dwek. These cited portions of Dwek describe that the user interface of the media player may include a “pay-per-listen” button that allows a user to purchase content, whether the content is a broadcast event, CD, or downloadable version of the content. Thus, Dwek merely describes a process of purchasing content, or music, based on interaction between the personal computer 130 and the music library 110.

At no point does Dwek teach or suggest that his system includes *an authentication server* that “send[s] a notification *to said content providing server by which said requested site is produced, that starting of service provision for said mobile information terminal be permitted*, if the unique identification information is found registered with said customer database [of the authentication server],” as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 13.

Kirani, the secondary reference, is relied upon only to assert the existence of an identification code in a mobile device and fails to remedy the above noted deficiency in Dwek. Therefore, none of the cited references, neither alone nor in combination teach or suggest Applicant’s Claims 1 and 3-13 which include the above distinguished limitations by virtue of independent recitation or dependency.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1 and 3-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 be withdrawn.

Claims 14-18 are added by the present amendment and further define features recited in independent Claim 13. Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 14-18 patentably define over the applied references at least by virtue of their dependency from Claim 13, and that each of new Claims 14-18 individually recite features that patentably define over the applied references.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1 and 3-18 is patentably distinguishing over the applied references. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of the application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Andrew T. Harry
Registration No. 56,959

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ATH\PROSECUTION\21s\212668-US\212668US - AM DUE 7-6-08.DOC